

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-44 were pending in the current application prior to this submission. The Examiner objected to claims 18, 25 and 42-43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As best understood, claims 1-17, 19-24, 26-41 and 44 were rejected by the Examiner in the previous Non-Final Office Action.

Claims 1, 17-18, 25, 29, 38, 40 and 41 have been amended herein. Claim 16 has been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added, and thus, entry and consideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Examiner objected to claims 18, 25, 42 and 43 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in at least claims 18, 25, 42 and 43, and reserve the right to amend the claims later in the prosecution.

### **III. Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection:**

As best understood, claims 1-17, 19-24, 26-41 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maja Sliskovic, Signal Processing Algorithm for OFDM Channel With Impulse Noise (hereafter, “Maja”) and Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB), framing structure, channel coding and modulation for digital terrestrial television, ETSI EN 300 744 V1.1.1, January 1002, Cover and pp. 2-49 (hereafter, “ETSI”), in view of Shalvi, et al., (U.S. 6,647,070, hereafter “Shalvi”). In particular, the Examiner alleges that the aforementioned claims are obvious in view of the combined teachings of the Maja, ETSI and Shalvi references.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and remarks presented herein. For example, amended claim 1 now recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:
  - detecting a presence of at least one impulse interference within a multi-carrier signal,
  - blanking samples where significant amount of the impulse noise caused by the at least one impulse interference is present to obtain a signal with blanking,
  - determining an estimate of the signal with blanking,
  - determining carrier correction values, which carrier correction values are based on deviations of certain carrier values compared to prior known information determined using a covariance function, and the blanking, and
  - influencing the estimate by the carrier correction values to obtain a representation of a desired signal.

Claim 1, as amended herein, incorporates the limitations of dependent claim 16 (now canceled). Support for these claim amendments may be found on pgs. 13-14, equations (8)-(12), in the original disclosure. Applicants have amended claim 1 to further distinguish the claimed embodiment of the present invention from the references relied upon by the Examiner. More specifically, the Examiner rejected dependent claim 16 (now incorporated into amended claim 1) as being obvious in view of the Maja reference, pg. 223, column 2, section 3. The cited section in Maja discloses the detection of signal samples corrupted with impulse noise, not with determining a carrier correction value as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Maja explaining how the approaches used for detecting signal samples corrupted with impulse noise would be applicable to determining a correction value (e.g., see equations (12) and (13) of Maja, which may be considered to correspond to estimating corrupted samples).

Further to the above, the sections that were relied upon in Maja for rejecting claim 16 (now incorporated into amended claim 1) actually refer to an autocorrelation function, not to a covariance function. The difference between these concepts would be clearly apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Furthermore, Maja does not include any teaching or suggestion that would provide motivation to replace an autocorrelation function, used in the context of detection of signal samples corrupted with impulse noise or for any other purpose, with a covariance function as explicitly set forth in amended claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully assert that neither the ETSI nor Shalvi references remedy the deficiencies in Maja identified above with respect to amended claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that at least amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. The other pending independent claims have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and thus, are asserted to be likewise distinguishable. Any other pending claim that is not specifically addressed above is distinguishable at least for depending from the pending independent claims. Thus, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection to the above-identified claims now be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of the claim objections/rejections and allowance of this application.

### **AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 504827, Order No. 1004289-198US(4208-4226).

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 504827, Order No. 1004289-198US(4208-4226).

Respectfully submitted,  
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP

Dated: August 20, 2010

By:



---

Elliot Frank  
Registration No. 56,641

Correspondence Address:

Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8600 Telephone  
(212) 303-2754 Facsimile